

The Theory of Mr. John C. Hurd of Boston

A learned but not well-digested book has

And here I am led to remark that it is entirely unnecessary to consider the abstract question whether sovereignty is divisible, or whether the nation is one or many. The question is not separated from one another. Some writers and publicists maintain that sovereignty is a unit and that one part of it cannot, in the nature of things, be separated irrevocably from another part. They admit that one sovereign people can make a compact with another; they say that from a compact there can be no withdrawal, *locus pœnitentiæ* a reserved right to withdraw from the compact. This depends entirely upon what the compact is. It is a practical question, to be solved upon the facts of the case. If a sovereign and independent people make a compact with another sovereign people, by which the latter is to exercise, in their territory, by its instrument attested by our hands, seals, coin, and transfer to government which we hereby constitute over ourselves certain of our powers of sovereignty, they have divided their sovereignty. A portion of it is given away, and the rest remains in their hands. The compact is irrevocable, and the cession is something more than a compact or league between nations, dissoluble upon the principles and in the modes in which treaties may be abrogated. It is a very different thing. It is a cession, a grant, a transfer of political power. It is a compact, but it is not a compact with other people who have long previously the same thing; and it is no more in its nature revocable than a deed of property is revocable at the pleasure of the grantor. The cession of political powers is irrevocable in such a case, because the thing is lost and is not divided; because the people who have long previously powers and exercised all the rights, lost all the

from adopting an ordinance of secession, or from doing any other unconstitutional act or paper; but that it had ample power under the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State, notwithstanding its ordinance of secession, to obey the laws of the United States, and, if need be, to use military force for the execution of the laws of the Union, and for maintaining possession of its public property. Its denial of the power to make aggressive war, and its refusal to recognize the right of any State to secede, were of foreign nature, did not detract one iota from the power to enforce the laws of the United States upon the individual inhabitants of the State, in spite of their attempt to absolve themselves from the duty of obeying those laws. The ordinance of secession was a crime. The distinction was not only palpable, but it was of the utmost consequence; for without it, a case it should become necessary to resort to force the general Government could have no legal basis on which to rest a resort to force.

Moreover, this ordinance, in so far as concerning the right of a State to secede, after the outbreak of civil war had occurred, was entirely consistent with the employment of all the laws and resources of war, to remove all obstructions to the execution of the laws of the United States throughout the Union, including the machinery of the Government, and the military and military array; consistent with a purpose to destroy that Government; consistent with the concession that, for the time being, of the belligerent character, as a power *de facto*, and the denial to it of any character as a power *de jure*. Not only did the doctrine on which Mr. Buchanan acted, but the course which he pursued, and the general principles of the subsequent course

[illegible]

Time (h)	Sleeping (%)	Sedentary (%)	Light (%)	Moderate (%)	Vigorous (%)
0	100	0	0	0	0
1	100	0	0	0	0
2	100	0	0	0	0
3	100	0	0	0	0
4	100	0	0	0	0
5	100	0	0	0	0
6	100	0	0	0	0
7	100	0	0	0	0
8	100	0	0	0	0
9	100	0	0	0	0
10	100	0	0	0	0
11	100	0	0	0	0
12	100	0	0	0	0
13	100	0	0	0	0
14	100	0	0	0	0
15	100	0	0	0	0
16	100	0	0	0	0
17	100	0	0	0	0
18	100	0	0	0	0
19	100	0	0	0	0
20	100	0	0	0	0
21	100	0	0	0	0
22	100	0	0	0	0
23	100	0	0	0	0
24	100	0	0	0	0

The assertion that seven-tenths of all the coal that has been dug out of the anthracite mines of Pennsylvania is the yield of one great seam called the "Mammoth" is probably without foundation in the truth. The "Mammoth" is one of the seams which are the best product of the field for the best coal. They are generally white ash, and on antinodal slopes, but little subject to faults. The "Mammoth" and the two works-a-side seams below it have produced at least nine-tenths of the anthracite coal that has been sent to market.

It is, however, facts that reflect disgracefully on the management of the mines, which concern consumers as well as producers of anthracite coal. From the seams already worked out, less than one-third of the estimated quantity of their contents has been sent to market. The waste is due to a variety of causes and faults; but by far the largest proportion of the loss is due to wasteful mining, breaking up and slinging the coal, and the resultant loss of five per cent thrown on the dumps. Bear in mind that this has been the practical result in working the thickest, most valuable, and the cheapest of the seams.

The American system of mining, which has been steadily practiced in Pennsylvania, is the obsolete English method known as "pillar and breast." It is the most wasteful method known, and the one that requires the least skill. It consists of working out the coal in rooms or

	Production, million tons
Southern	1,000,000
Central	1,000,000
Eastern	1,000,000
Western	1,000,000
Yukon	1,000,000
Alaska	1,000,000
Canada	1,000,000
USA	1,000,000
Europe	1,000,000
Asia	1,000,000
Africa	1,000,000
Australia	1,000,000
South America	1,000,000
Other	1,000,000

Wine of Ismet on the Giant's Mountain.

[illegible][illegible]